

threat to the security of health with reference to our oldest citizens, all of those initiatives, including the one concerning putting more law enforcement officers in our neighborhoods, all of those initiatives that the Gingrich leadership declared they had to have in order to have a revolution, they have now yielded on in this new budget bill.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: MURRAY WILSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana.

In the Second Congressional District of Indiana there are so many good people. Good people doing good things. In my book, these special individuals are Hoosier heros. Hoosier heros because they have dedicated their lives to helping others.

Mr. Speaker, Murray Wilson of Winchester, IN, is a Hoosier hero. He provides hope that one person can make a difference.

Murray Wilson has dedicated his life to raising support for local charities in his hometown. He knows in his heart that the greatest gift in life is to help others. During the day you'll find Murray washing dishes at D&J's Family Restaurant to provide for his wife, Debbie, and their 18-month-old daughter, Brittany. But his evenings are spent writing letters, rounding up pledges and championing his support drives.

Murray's efforts are sort of a legend. Ask anyone in Randolph County and they'll tell you: "Murray spends endless hours raising support for the March of Dimes, the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association and the list goes on * * *."

But if you ask Murray Wilson why he has made his life-mission to raise support for charitable organizations, he'll humbly tell you, "I just like to help people." To me, Mr. Speaker, that is the true American spirit.

Reach out. Lend a helping hand. Try to make a difference.

Murray Wilson may never meet the individuals who benefit from his effort. But he knows in his heart, that he's making his community a better place by lending a helping hand for those less fortunate.

Murray Wilson continues to make a difference. And for that reason, Murray Wilson of Winchester, IN, is a Hoosier hero.

Mr. Speaker, that is my report from Indiana.

□ 1330

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL LOGGING SALVAGE RIDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, last July it was about 10:30 at night, and this House passed the notorious timber salvage rider. That rider was slipped onto a bill that actually gave funding to the Oklahoma bombing victims. We knew at the time, some of us, that it was a bad idea, this bill. We knew this rider was a bad idea.

Yesterday, it just got worse, much worse. Yesterday, the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the logging rider, which is called by the people of this country the lawless logging rider, that this logging rider, requires the Forest Service to immediately release for logging every timber sale ever offered in every national forest in Washington and Oregon since 1990, even though those sales were stopped because they are old growth sales in environmentally sensitive areas. Not only are they old growth sales, Mr. Speaker, but they are critical for endangered fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell people that this bill has been called the salvage rider, but let me tell the Members about some of the trees that are being cut. Some of those trees are nearly 1,000 years old. They are not salvage, they are the heritage of the people of this country. Those are trees on public land, land set aside for the people, and yet, under this lawless logging rider, under this rider, the people have been shut out. Under this rider, all laws that protect that public heritage have been suspended.

Mr. Speaker, although the Forest Service is talking about salvage, we find that in fact they are reclassifying some healthy forests as salvage. So not only is this lifting the laws, not only is this shutting out the American people, but it is also a lie, because these trees are not salvage, they are healthy.

I introduced on December 7 a repeal of the lawless logging rider, and I have been joined on a bipartisan basis by 139 cosponsors. Why did I introduce this repeal? First of all, I knew it was wrong, this bill, in the first place. But then the trees began to come down in my district. Then the letters began to pour in. I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, some of those letters.

Here is one from a small woodland owner. He said: "I speak for a large, unheard constituency in this debate. We manage our property in a sound manner, economically and environmentally, and we object to the Government doing otherwise." He opposes the salvage rider.

Here is someone from Asheville, NC, who wrote to me and said:

Thank you for introducing the repeal of the rider. I have worked all my career as a forest entomologist. I can assure you that this bill is a Trojan horse intended to get at good timber. It has been a practice for 9 years that to get a timber operator to remove infested pine, it was tacitly agreed that he would get plenty of good timber as an incentive.

I have heard from someone who says that he is a business person: "If anyone tries to tell you that business interests oppose environmental interests, I will tell you that is old-fashioned bunk. I am a small business person and I object to the rider."

Then I got a letter from John Jonathan Alward. He said: "Please continue to fight the salvage logging law. I am a Boy Scout. I believe the law is bad because it allows logging companies to strip away the natural beauty of the Northwest."

Here is one from a grandfather, who says he is outraged, outraged that it passed last summer.

Then I have one from a 67-year-old grandmother, 40 years an Oregon resident. She says: "I love this State, and I am sickened by what Congress is allowing to happen to its natural beauty and its environment."

A biologist. This is not a special interest group, Mr. Speaker. This is the people of the United States who own this land, who own this timber. He says: "As a biologist, I am greatly concerned with the deleterious effect of the salvage rider."

So I introduced the repeal of the salvage rider. What does that mean? What does it mean to repeal the salvage rider? It means we just go back to the way it used to be with the laws that had been passed by the Congress protecting the public interest. What it means when we repeal the rider is that once again we put the law in the forest, and once again we put the public interest over the special interest. We need to protect public land. It is the American heritage. I urge my colleagues to join me in repealing the so-called salvage rider. Please support 2745. Repeal the lawless logging.

AMERICANS ARE PAYING MORE AND GETTING LESS FOR EDUCATION, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, in just a few hours the House of Representatives will probably decide one of the most important questions that has faced the Nation and this Congress. I have only been here for a little over 36 months, and there are some wonderful people in the House of Representatives that I have had the opportunity to serve with. I just wanted to give my observations of where we are at this moment as we decide on a budget, which is long overdue.

Congress, in fact, has been bankrupting our Nation with good intentions from some very well-meaning and well-intended people. The debate over the past 4 months has really been the most important debate in, I think, the last 40 years.

But we have found that in this debate, if we look at what has happened,

over those 40 years we have created scores and scores of programs, programs in education, programs in job training, programs in environment and so on. But this is what the debate has evolved down to.

However, the fundamental question being asked today is how effective are those programs. That is what this new majority continues to ask and has pressured to find the questions and the answers to. Mr. Speaker, for a moment Congress and the American people must really ask today are we paying more and getting less. That really is what the budget debate has been about. Let me, if I can, Mr. Speaker, just give a few examples of what the debate is about and how the American taxpayer is paying more and getting less. I have talked on the floor about these items.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in education. The education battle is down to not just how much money we throw at education, but what the results are. Part of the debate is these 3,322 bureaucrats out of 4,876 in a Federal Department of Education, over 3,300 right down the street in Washington, earning more than most of our teachers, and most of them have never been in a classroom. This is what the debate is about, how big that bureaucracy is going to be.

The debate is about why our children cannot read, why our scores are lower, the dumbing down of the standards in this country, which are on the front page of even our periodicals.

There are Head Start Programs like in my community, where I have 25 administrators and 25 uncertified teachers, and the administrators are making double what the teachers or the aides are making in our Head Start Program; about an AmeriCorps Program the President has proposed that is a volunteer program that pays more and better benefits than we are giving our veterans, and the GAO says their finances in a year for this \$1 billion project, they are already in a shambles.

Then we turn to job training, another question. Here is an article, a report from the State: \$1 billion in job training in my State, and this evaluation in the last month says that we are spending \$1 billion, and less than 20 percent of the students who enter these job training programs ever complete them and 19 percent ever get a job afterward. Then they get a low-paying minimal job; a total failure in job training programs. That is what this debate is about is changing these programs, improving them, so young people have an opportunity and a job.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, about the environment: Paying more and getting less. We have heard about Superfund. We have heard the President talk about this. Superfund is a great example of a good program gone bad and that we are trying to change. It was a good idea to clean up hazardous wastesites, but it is not a good idea to spend 80 percent of the money on attorneys' fees and studies. It is not a good idea to let polluters

off the hook and not have them pay. It is not a good idea to have very few sites cleaned up. Only a handful of the hundreds and hundreds of sites have been cleaned up.

So these programs are failures. That is what this debate is about. It is a fundamental debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we clean up the act of government. We may not get another chance. Mr. Speaker, this is about paying more and getting less, whether it is in education, whether it is in the environment, or whether it is in job training. We should not pay more and get less.

THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE SHOULD HEAR THEIR LEADERS SAY THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE TO PEACE WITH ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday the Palestinian Assembly finally took steps to amend their charter, which calls for Israel's destruction. I have been speaking about that for a number of years here on the House floor. The United States aid to the Palestinian entity, which is about a half a billion dollars, is predicated on the removal of those covenants. Just last week I took that to the House floor and said that the date, May 7, is the date by which the covenants must be amended. According to United States law that date is 2 months after the Palestinian elections.

Yesterday the Palestinian Assembly did take steps to remove the covenants. The council amends the Palestinian national covenant by canceling clauses which contradict the letters exchanged between the PLO and the Israel Government. So, in essence, the clauses which contradict the letters exchanged by the PLO and the Israeli Government are those clauses which call for the destruction of Israel.

That is a positive step, although I must say, Mr. Speaker, it would have been far better if they would have been much more explicit and explicitly mentioned the covenants which are revoked. That would have been a lot better. Still, I want to give credit where credit is due.

The second thing to which they agreed was that the Palestinian Assembly would draft a new charter within a few short months. We are going to be looking and we are going to be seeing what is the language in that charter. We want to make sure that the new charter that is drafted has language which is compatible with pursuing peace. I think that is very, very important.

Again, while I commend the Palestinian authority and commend Yasser Arafat for taking steps finally to remove the covenants which call for Israel's destruction, I want them to know that we in the United States Congress

will continue to monitor the situation very closely and continue to watch the new charter which is going to be drafted by the Palestinian assembly.

We do not want double talk. The problem on the Palestinian side for too long has been doublespeak, talking out of 10 or 15 sides of their mouth. If you want peace you need to be unequivocal, you need to state that you want peace, and you need to say it both in English and in Arabic, so it is not only for American public opinion consumption but it is for the home crowd, so to speak. The Palestinian people should hear their leaders say that there is no alternative to peace with Israel. I wanted to say that.

I wanted to also comment on some of the other events in the Middle East. I found it a bit hypocritical that the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva condemned Israel for the bombings in Lebanon, in a totally one-sided and ridiculous resolution, which said nothing about the Hezbollah guerillas which started this whole thing. The United States, to our credit, voted against it. There were only a handful of countries voting against it.

I thought it was especially hypocritical for the U.N. Human Rights Commission to do that, at the same time when the U.N. Human Rights Commission recommendations against the human rights abuse in China were not supported by the majority of countries voting, so it is hypocrisy, again. I think that is a bit ridiculous.

In Lebanon, Mr. Speaker, we ought to call it the way it is. That is, clearly, that the disruption and the hardship on both the Israeli population and the Lebanese population near the border rests solely with Syria, and with Hafiz al-Asad.

□ 1345

Syria, in essence, controls Lebanon. Lebanon has really ceased to exist as a free and independent state. There are 40,000 Syrian troops in Lebanon, and if the Syrian troops wanted to, they could control Hezbollah. They could prevent Hezbollah from wreaking havoc on Israeli civilians just south of the border.

That is what happened again and again and again during the past few weeks. No government at all can tolerate the wanton shelling of its citizens without some kind of response, and that is exactly what the Israeli Government has done. They have responded to the Hezbollah attacks.

Now, the Israeli attacks have hurt and killed civilians, and it is very, very unfortunate that civilians are maimed or killed. But it should be remembered that the Israeli troops, the Israeli attacks are going after the Hezbollah terrorists, whereas Hezbollah is specifically going after Israeli civilians.

So I say to the Syrian Government and to Mr. Assad, who talks a good game of peace but has shown absolutely zero, the nerve of him to keep our Secretary of State waiting and not